



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

king of the gods," should be rather "who became king of the gods themselves," "the very gods" (one of the points of the argument is that it is absurd that the gods should have a king or that the king of the gods should masquerade).

For such a long text the volume seems remarkably free from typographical errors and lesser slips; but I have noted the following: p. 114, *εἰδάζαν*; p. 228, *ὠφελοντων*; p. 274, *γινῶσκων* (faulty breathings or accents); p. 354, *εἰ-δεχέες* (wrong syllable division); "straight" for *τεθλιμμένην* on p. 47, but "strait" on pp. 22 and 157; p. 194, *οὐ σχολάζω σήμερον συναγωνίσασθαί σοι* is omitted in the translation, as is also, p. 240, *ταύτην προκρίνας τῆς αὐτοῦ δόξης*; a question mark is wrongly used for a period in p. 229, "'Would God,' said Ioasaph, 'that he too were instructed in these mysteries?'" (*sic*); the same mistake occurs on p. 417, ninth line from the bottom; p. 545, second line, "have" should be "has" (cf. the Greek); p. 559, line 8, "has" for "hast." On p. 400, *τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ* is read, but the variant *ὄντος* (which is noted) is translated.

The translators have contented themselves with Boissonade's Greek text and note but few variants. I suspect that a change should be made in p. 44, *ἐποίησε κατὰ δὴ καὶ αὐτῷ λελάληκεν*, reading either *καθό* or *καθά*. I have not been able to inspect Boissonade's text, but have noted that in the Migne edition *κατὰ* occurs.

FRANK EGGLESTON ROBBINS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Propertius with an English Translation. By H. E. BUTLER. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: William Heinemann; New York: Macmillan, 1912. Pp. xvi+363.

Professor Butler has equipped his translation with a brief Introduction on the Life of Propertius, the Manuscripts, the Division into Books, a Bibliographical Note, and an Explanatory Index. In the Introduction there are a great many errors of fact and some expressions of opinion with which few students of Propertius will agree. The cognomen Nauta, for example, is certainly not "demonstrably absurd" because "Propertius expresses the liveliest terror of the sea in his poems." Indeed, no convincing argument has ever been brought forward against the manuscript authority on this point, and of recent years scholars have even shown a disposition to retain Aurelius, which Professor Butler rejects for the traditional reasons; cf. Marx (*Lucilius*, II, 198), "librarios Aureli nomen temere addidisse Propertio in codicibus nondum demonstratum est: immo commendat poetae nomen duplex Aurelii Opilii grammatici ratio."

The text seems to be a slightly revised version of that contained in Professor Butler's complete edition of 1905, which was based upon the work of

Baehrens, Postgate, and Phillimore. The editor believes that the "text of Propertius is undoubtedly very corrupt. The sequence of thought is at times so broken that the reader necessarily concludes that one of two things has happened: (a) couplets have been lost, or (b) the order of the lines has been dislocated." This is an untenable position. The supposed dislocations of the thought are, in the vast majority of instances, merely a reflex of the elegiac mood. If we add to this generic incoherence those difficulties which are due to the very peculiar style of Propertius, we have accounted for a very large part of the supposed corruptions. The residue is no greater than one would expect of a text which rests upon manuscripts of the eleventh and later centuries.

Professor Butler's practice, however, is better than his theory. He accepts only a dozen of more than a thousand transpositions which have been proposed and he marks only half a dozen lacunae. In the more circumscribed difficulties which are so numerous in Propertius he has not always displayed the best judgment (cf. i. 2. 25; i. 8. 19; i. 17. 11; i. 18. 23, etc.), but his text is on the whole conservative and good.

In the Note on the Division into Books I miss a reference to Birt's attractive explanation of the *tres libelli*—the very explanation, apparently, for which Professor Butler is seeking; cf. Birt, *Antike Buchwesen* (1882) and *Rhein. Mus.*, LXIV (1909); Ullman, *Class. Phil.*, IV (1909).

Some errors have crept into the Bibliographical Note. Beroaldus did not publish the "first edition of Propertius." Lachmann, not Baehrens, "was the first to put the text on a scientific basis." Lachmann's edition of 1829 was not, as Professor Butler implies, a commentary. The date of Plessis' *Études sur Properce* is 1884, not 1886. Whatever the cause of these errors—perhaps the hurry with which the Loeb series is being rushed through the press—it is regrettable that the readers who may be stimulated to use this material should find it so inaccurate, for they are the very readers who should be made to feel that the series is reliable.

Translations of Propertius must be judged with more than ordinary charity. The difficulties are so great that, as Professor Butler says, "an apology for . . . deficiencies is . . . unnecessary." Indeed, a fitting caption for the attempt would have been the words of the poet about another insuperable task, *in magnis et voluisse sat est*. And yet Professor Butler would have succeeded far better if he had consistently maintained the only principle which he professes to follow—that of keeping close to the original. But closeness is very often directly opposed to Mr. Loeb's ideal of a rendering that shall be "a real piece of literature," and to this ideal the translator evidently inclines in spite of the fact that a prose translation of a Greek or Roman poet cannot be at the same time "a real piece of literature" and (in any true sense) a faithful rendering. The result in the present instance is but a loose approximation of Propertian values. The translation belongs in fact to the familiar type for which a sort of translation prose has been

developed—a style employed exclusively for the rendering of classical poets. This type of translation is usually explicit where the original is vague; it intrudes metaphors where the original has none, or changes unnecessarily those which exist; it expands and interprets, and the English is shot with an excess of archaisms and toplofty expressions. These are little things when viewed separately, but wrong pigments distort the finished picture and the constant recurrence of these little things makes of elegy something all too lofty. Elegy is often lofty, but it is often just the opposite; it is not epic nor even lyric, but a much more elastic medium than either. The system which Professor Butler follows causes him not infrequently to miss the many gradations of tone—especially the colloquial, which is so prominent in Propertius.

This translation, therefore, will appeal to those who like such renderings as “love-distraught” (*amens*), “the frown of heaven” (*adversos deos*), “in the gyves of love” (*in amore*), “by Colchian charms” (*Cytaeines . . . carminibus*), etc.—it will be reckoned good work of its type. But to the present reviewer the most successful passages are those which are least typical. The pretty renderings of ii. 11 and parts of iv. 8, for example, prove that the translator might have reached a high average of excellence if he had not chosen a wrong system.

ARTHUR LESLIE WHEELER

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

Xenophon Cyropaedia. Translated by WALTER MILLER. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: William Heinemann; New York: Macmillan. In 2 volumes. \$1.50.

The sketch of the life and works of Xenophon in the Introduction, though brief, gives the readers the point of view necessary for the appreciation of the work to follow.

The translation is an admirable example of clear readable English. It is free from pedantry and yet as precise as could be desired in the interpretation of the Greek text. In style it reproduces successfully the easy-going and semi-colloquial manner of the original. The precision of the translation is, perhaps, best seen in the particles. The author does not hesitate to devote a phrase or a clause to rendering the full meaning of an elusive particle or to supply the ellipsis arising from the combination of two particles. A few instances are *ἄρα* (“as it may well be”), i. 6. 41; *δ’ οὖν* (“be that as it may”), ii. 3. 11; *καὶ γάρ*, iv. 3. 3 and v. 1. 25; *ἀλλὰ γάρ*, vi. 2. 22; *καὶ γὰρ δή*, vii. 5. 11.

For the ellipsis “Then too he rather wished to stay where he was” in translating *καὶ γάρ* (iv. 1. 13) I should like to suggest “This too was to be expected.” The particles do not add any new idea but give the reason for *μὴ πάλιν κινδυνεύειν* to which Cyaxares refers again at the close of his speech—